

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1, 6-10, 14, and 15 have been amended. Claims 2-5 and 11-13 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 6-10, and 14-16 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action at pages 2-8, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,708 to Pedrizetti, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,950,173 to Perkowski. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a service processor control system. In relevant part, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "a first client connected to a service processor connected to said host and said Internet, having at least a maintenance service function" and "a second client connected to the Internet and having the browser." Further, amended independent claim 1 recites that "the first client and the second client are configured to receive the component information from the component information storage server," "the first client and the second client are configured to execute control relating to said service processor through said browser, thereby setting and controlling the hardware state of said host based on said control information and said setting information," "said component information, said control information, and said setting information are described in XML and said browser supports XML," and "the first client and the second client are configured to execute control over information on said service processor using XML including a tag for defining a type of information on hardware of said host by document type definition (DTD), the type of information being binary." Independent claims 10 and 15 have been similarly amended. In a non-limiting example, the amended independent claims provide for control of a service processor through more than one console, reducing the labor and cost required to deliver and maintain component information, and enhancing the versatility related to controlling of the service processor. See Specification at page 3, line 16 to page 4, line 14.

Applicant respectfully submits that Pedrizetti and Perkowski, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 1. Neither Pedrizetti nor Perkowski teach or suggest that "said component information, said control

information, and said setting information are described in XML" or that "the first client and the second client are configured to execute control over information on said service processor using XML including a tag for defining a type of information on hardware of said host by document type definition (DTD), the type of information being binary," as recited in amended independent claim 1. In a non-limiting example, the characteristics of XML allow for easy structuralization of various types of component information, including binary information, as described in the originally filed Specification at page 23, lines 11-14. Further, this can be achieved by more than one client so long as the additional client has a browser.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Pedrizetti, in contrast, teaches only that "the definition file is written as an Open Software Distribution (OSD) file, which is a file format based on the Extensible Markup Language (XML)." Pedrizetti at col. 10, lines 26-29. Perkowski is alleged to teach that component information includes at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice, where the manual and the diagram are displayed in a human-readable manner on the browser, and that the invention offers 24-hour availability with accurate, up-to-date product information. Applicant respectfully submits that, taken in combination with Pedrizetti, Perkowski fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies in Pedrizetti. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Pedrizetti and Perkowski, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 1 and those claims depending either directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 and those claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

As independent claims 10 and 15 have been amended to recite features similar to those of amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 15, and those claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least those reasons set forth with respect to amended independent claim 1 and, therefore, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

June 2, 2005

By:

David M. Pitcher

David M. Pitcher

Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501